

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119, and receipt of certified copies of the priority documents submitted July 18, 2003.

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering the references cited with the Information Disclosure Statement filed July 18, 2003.

Status of the Application

Claims 1-33 are all the claims pending in the Application. Claims 1-33 have been rejected.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 14-16, 18, 23-25, 29, 32 and 33 have been amended in a clarifying manner only.

Anticipation Rejection

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3-12, 14-22 and 24-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Fujiwara* (US 5,455,647; hereinafter “*Fujiwara*”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claims 1, 11 and 21

Fujiwara discloses an automatic focusing system, as shown in FIG. 1. This system simply provides two electronic distance detecting units 101 and 102 that obtain ranging signals for different areas on screen 1 by use of distance detecting units (col. 3, lines 47-52) emitting infrared light 38, 68 (col. 4, line 7) from floodlight elements 36, 66. Light receiving elements 41, 71 receive reflected infrared light, signal processing circuits 43, 73 calculate ranging signals 44, 74, and controller 32 then calculates the distance to an object and the degree of screen inclination based upon the values of ranging signals 44, 74 (col. 4, lines 52-59).

The Examiner takes the position that *Fujiwara* discloses all of the features of independent claims 1, 11 and 21.

Regarding claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that *Fujiwara* fails to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, a projector comprising “an image sensor which is placed in the vicinity of said projection lens and images the screen and the image projected onto the screen.”

Specifically, the only portions of *Fujiwara* that could even remotely be considered to be sensors are infrared light receiving elements 41, 71. However, these elements do not image the “screen and the image projected onto the screen.” In contrast, these elements merely receive infrared light emitted from infrared floodlight elements 36, 66 and reflected from screen 1 and output electric signals based upon the incident position of that light spot. This infrared light is separate from any image projected by projector 104 of *Fujiwara*.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that *Fujiwara* fails to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, a projector comprising “means for detecting a projection display area” and/or “means for detecting a screen area.”

Specifically, no area measurement of any kind is disclosed by *Fujiwara*, as its focusing system is based upon trigonometric calculations using distance measurements from distance detecting units 101 and 102 to points 1b and 1c. These simple distance calculations are not effective to measure the area of the “projection display” or “screen.”

Regarding claim 11, Applicants respectfully submit that *Fujiwara* fails to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, an image distortion correction method comprising “imaging said screen by an

image sensor installed in the vicinity of said projection lens,” or “detecting the area of said screen from an imaged screen image.”

Specifically, as discussed above with respect to claim 1, *Fujiwara*’s infrared light receiving elements 41, 71 receive only reflected infrared light to determine a distance from screen 1. These light receiving elements 41, 71 cannot reasonably be read as being capable of imaging of a screen, nor can the simple distance measurement provide any indication of the area of the screen.

Regarding claim 21, Applicants respectfully submit that *Fujiwara* fails to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, a projector comprising “an image sensor for imaging said screen and the image projected onto said screen.”

Specifically, as discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 11, *Fujiwara* only discloses infrared light receiving elements 41, 71 that determine a distance to screen 1. These light receiving elements 41, 71 cannot reasonably be read as being capable of imaging a screen and an image projected thereon.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 11 and 21 are patentable over the applied reference. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that rejected dependent claims 2-10, 12-20 and 22-33 are allowable, *at least* by virtue of their dependency.

Regarding claims 2, 13 and 23, which the Examiner has rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Fujiwara* in view of *JP ‘593*, Applicants respectfully submit that: (1) these claims are allowable *at least* by virtue of their dependency; and (2) *JP ‘593* does not teach or suggest the features indicated above which are missing from *Fujiwara*. Specifically,

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No.: 10/621,366

Attorney Docket # Q76549

JP '593 only discloses a system vaguely similar to *Fujiwara* that measures distances between a projector and a screen.

Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-33 are allowable. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the application now is in condition for allowance with all of the claims 1-33.

If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Please charge any fees which may be required to maintain the pendency of this application, except for the Issue Fee, to our Deposit Account No. 19-4880.

Respectfully submitted,



Timothy P. Cremen
Registration No. 50,855

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: March 24, 2004